



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,607	06/10/2005	Marco Van Leeuwen	NL 021252	5384
24737 7590 08/08/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER KEATON, SHERROD L	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/538,607	Applicant(s) VAN LEEUWEN, MARCO	
	Examiner sherrod keaton	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2005.
 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 7-21 is/are rejected.
 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6-10-05, 3-03-06</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the original filing of June 10, 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending and has been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 12, 17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seidensticker Jr et al (6128012).

Claim 1: **Seidensticker** discloses a method for presenting a long list of items, comprising the steps of:

displaying one page containing a predetermined number (N/p) of items in one section (31) of a display screen (3)(Column 12 , Lines 20-47) A predetermined amount of games are going to be displayed to the user for selection;

receiving a step size selection command from a user; setting a step size in response to the step size selection command received (Column 12, Lines 49-63) here a step selection is received in response to the length of the depression a size or step amount is determined;

receiving a step command (UP/DOWN) from a user (Column 12, Lines 49-63);

displaying a new page of items, wherein the distance between the new page and the previously displayed page is equal to said step size (Column 13, Lines 15-54) depending on the scroll the display shows the top page of the list or bottom page of the list.

Claim 2: **Seidensticker** discloses a method as in claim 1 above, and further discloses comprising the step of displaying a set of browse control tools (40) in a second section (36) of said display screen (3); wherein said browse control tools (40) (Column 5, Lines 7-36) comprise a plurality of hierarchic indicator volumes (41, 42, . . .) each comprising a plurality of page indicators (51, 52, . . .) (Column 6, Lines 24-43).

Claim 7: **Seidensticker** discloses a system (1) for presenting a long list of items, comprising a display device (2) having a screen (3), user input means (4), and a CPU (6), the system being designed to perform the method according to claim 1 (Figure 1; Column 5, Lines 5-36).

Claim 12: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, and further discloses wherein said user input means comprise a keyboard (10) comprising an UP key (14) and a DOWN key (15), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret an actuation of said UP key (14) or said DOWN key (15) as a step command (UP/DOWN) (Column

5, Lines 7-35; Column 12, Lines 49-63). The up and down buttons determine the scroll and variable speed.

Claim 17: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7 and further discloses a design to display a plurality of bar indicators (61, 62, . . . 65) associated with corresponding page indicator volumes (41, 42, . . . 45), wherein said CPU (6) is designed to display in an ON state the one bar indicator corresponding to the ACTIVE volume (Column 12, Lines 20-47). The game that is actively being looked at is in bold representing an "ON " state.

Claim 19: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7 and further discloses wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a click action or touch action at one of said page indicators as a combined step size selection command and step command (UP/DOWN). (Column 12, Lines 49-63) here a step selection is received in response to the length of the depression a size or step amount is determined by the clicking of the up or down button.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2174

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 8-11, 13-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker Jr et al (6128012) in view of Davis (2002/0135602 A1) .

Claim 8: Seidensticker discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said user input means comprise a keyboard (10) comprising a LEFT key (12) and a RIGHT key (13), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret an actuation of said LEFT key (12) or said RIGHT key (13) as a step size selection command.

However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses Left and right scroll direction (Page 4, Paragraph 40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have left and right scroll options with the step scroll of Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include left and right scroll to add user operability to the system for scrolling of horizontally long data.

Claim 9: Seidensticker discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said user input means comprise a mouse device (20) comprising a LEFT mouse key (21) and a RIGHT mouse key (22), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret an actuation of said LEFT mouse key (21) or said RIGHT mouse key (22) as a step size selection command. However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse (Page 2, Paragraph 15). Therefore it would

Art Unit: 2174

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to left and right keys of the mouse as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include left and right keys of the mouse as scroll options to add user operability and familiarity by providing device options a user will have well known interaction with.

Claim 10: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, designed to display a LEFT command icon (60L) and a RIGHT command icon (60R) on said screen (3), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a click action at said LEFT command icon (60L) or said RIGHT command icon (60R) as a step size selection command. However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse a screen pointing device and stylus (a touch device) (Page 2, Paragraph 15) and Left and Right command icons activated by a click action (Page 4, Paragraphs 35 and 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use click option of the icons as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include a click action command as a scroll option because it adds user operability and flexibility to the system in the case that keypad or touchpad is unavailable.

Claim 11: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, designed to display a LEFT command icon (60L) and a RIGHT command icon (60R) on said screen (3), wherein

Art Unit: 2174

said screen (3) is a touch screen, and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a touch action at said LEFT command icon (60L) or said RIGHT command icon (60R) as a step size selection command. However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse and stylus (a touch device) (Page 2, Paragraph 15) and Left and Right command icons (Page 4, Paragraph 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a touch action to the icons as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include a touch action command as a scroll option because it adds user operability and flexibility to the system in the case that keypad or mouse is unavailable.

Claim 13: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said user input means comprise a mouse device (20) comprising a scroll wheel (23), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret an actuation of said scroll wheel (23) as a step command (UP/DOWN). However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse for scrolling (Page 2, Paragraph 15). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the scroll wheel of the mouse as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include the scroll wheel of the mouse as scroll option to add user operability and familiarity by providing a device option that the user will have well known interaction with.

Claim 14: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose a designed display UP command icon (60U) and a DOWN command icon (60D) on said screen (3), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a click action at said UP command icon (60U) or said DOWN command icon (60D) as a step command (UP/DOWN). However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse a (screen pointing device) and stylus (a touch device) (Page 2, Paragraph 15) and Up and Down command icons activated by a click action (Page 4, Paragraphs 35 and 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use click option of the icons as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include a click action command as a scroll option because it adds user operability and flexibility to the system in the case that keypad or touchpad is unavailable.

Claim 15: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose a designed display UP command icon (60U) and a DOWN command icon (60D) on said screen (3), wherein said screen (3) is a touch screen, and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a touch action at said UP command icon (60U) or said DOWN command icon (60D) as a step command (UP/DOWN). However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and further discloses a mouse and

stylus (a touch device) (Page 2, Paragraph 15) and Up and Down command icons (Page 4, Paragraph 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a touch action to the icons as a step scroll in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include a touch action command as a scroll option because it adds user operability and flexibility to the system in the case that keypad or mouse is unavailable.

Claim 16: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7 but does not explicitly disclose, a design to display a plurality of UP command icons (71, 72, . . . 75) associated with corresponding page indicator volumes (41, 42, . . . 45) and a plurality of DOWN command icons (81, 82, . . . 85) associated with corresponding page indicator volumes (41, 42, . . . 45), and wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a click action or touch action at one of said UP or DOWN command icons (71, 72, . . . 75; 81, 82, . . . 85) as a combined step size selection command and step command (UP/DOWN). However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and Up and down options activated by click or touch (Figure 3B; Page 2, Paragraph 15; Page 4, Paragraph 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the variable options for page navigating in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include the additional options for navigation of a page to improve system operability and flexibility.

Claim 18: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 17, wherein said CPU (6) is designed to interpret a click action or touch action at one of said bar indicators (61, 62, . . . 65) as a step size selection command. However Davis discloses a scrolling method using screen pointing and Up and down options activated by click or touch (Page 2, Paragraph 15; Page 4, Paragraph 38-40). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the variable options for page navigating in Seidensticker as taught by Davis. One would have been motivated to include the additional options for navigation of a page to improve system operability and flexibility.

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SeidenstickerJr et al (6128012) in view of Driskell (US 6239803 B1).

Claim 20: **Seidensticker** discloses a system as in claim 7, but does not explicitly disclose wherein said CPU (6) is designed to calculate an appropriate number of volumes (N_v) and an appropriate number of page indicators ($N_{i/p}$) in each volume, taking into account size of screen, size of item, size of page indicator. However Driskell does disclose a method to achieve least effort from a item list and further discloses taking in to account screen space available, etc...(Column 3, Lines 48-Column 4, Lines 32). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to design the interface in proportion to screen real estate in

Seidensticker as taught by Driskell. One would have been motivated to do this to present the user a visually effective interface and reducing unnecessary clutter.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

3. A method as claimed in claim 2, wherein one of said indicator volumes (41, 42, . . .) is made ACTIVE in response to a step size selection command, and wherein the step size (SS) corresponds to one page size ($Sp = N_i/p$ items) if the first indicator volume (41) is ACTIVE, and wherein, if the n-th indicator volume is ACTIVE, the step size corresponds to the following formula $SS = (N_i \cdot \text{times.} / \text{times.} p) \cdot i = 1 \text{ } n - 1 \cdot \text{times.} \cdot \text{times.} (N_p \cdot \text{times.} / \text{times.} v \cdot \text{function.} (i)) \cdot \text{times.} \cdot \text{times.} \text{ items}$ wherein $N_p/v(i)$ indicates the number of page indicators in the i-th indicator volume.

4. A method as claimed in claim 3, wherein one of said page indicators in the ACTIVE volume is switched to an ON state in response to a step command (UP/DOWN).

5. A method as claimed in claim 4, wherein, in response to a step command (UP/DOWN), a currently ON page indicator within said ACTIVE volume is switched to

Art Unit: 2174

an OFF state while a page indicator adjacent said currently ON page indicator is switched to said ON state.

6. A method as claimed in claim 4, wherein, in response to a step command (UP/DOWN), if a currently ON page indicator within said ACTIVE volume is located at the end of the volume, said currently ON page indicator is switched to an OFF state while a page indicator at the opposite end of the ACTIVE volume is switched to said ON state, while also a currently ON page indicator within a second volume one hierarchic level higher than said ACTIVE volume is switched to an OFF state while a page indicator adjacent said currently ON page indicator within said second volume is switched to an ON state.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, KRISTINE KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2174

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK

7-25-07


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100